

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are pending. Claims 1, 3, 5, 8, 9, and 11-14 have been amended. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application based on the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Lee et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,822,360). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the claims did not specify that the delayed signal was a delayed version of the original audio signal. Although Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of the original claims, Applicants have amended the claims to more clearly recite that the delayed signal is a delay version of the original audio signal. Lee fails to disclose at least this feature of the claims because the signal s(t) and PN are not the same signals. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

A. Claims 3, 4, and 6-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Lee in view of Hannigan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,674,876). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 8 is believed allowable for at least the same reasons presented above with respect to claim 1 at least because claim 8 recites features that are similar to the features of claim 1 discussed above and because Hannigan does not remedy at least those deficiencies of Lee. Claims 3, 4, 6, and 7 are believed allowable for at least the reasons presented above with respect to claim 1 by virtue of their dependence upon claim 1 and because Hannigan does not remedy at least the deficiencies of Lee discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

B. Claims 9-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Hannigan in view of Hayashi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,434,253). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 9 and 14 each recites a method or apparatus for detecting a watermarked audio signal that uses a residual signal of a delayed version of the original audio signal that is delayed for a predetermined delay time (τ).

Applicants respectfully submit that Hannigan and Hayashi are both silent with respect to at least this feature of claims 9 and 14. Accordingly, no combination of Hannigan and Hayashi teach or suggest a method or apparatus for detecting a watermarked audio signal that uses a residual signal of a delayed version of the original audio signal that is delayed for a predetermined delay time (τ), as recited in claims 9 and 14.

Claims 10-13 are believed allowable for at least the same reasons presented above with respect to claim 9 by virtue of their dependence upon claim 9. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.


Conclusion

Therefore, all objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney for Applicants at the telephone number indicated below in order to expeditiously resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

MAYER BROWN ROWE & MAW LLP

By:  Reg No. 51,873
Yoon S. Ham
Registration No. 45,307
Direct No. (202) 263-3280

YSH/VVK

Intellectual Property Group
1909 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006-1101
(202) 263-3000 Telephone
(202) 263-3300 Facsimile

Date: June 8, 2006